THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

BROOKINGS CAFETERIA PODCAST

GLOBAL CHINA'S ENERGY AND CLIMATE POLICIES

Washington, D.C.

Friday, September 18, 2020

PARTICIPANTS:

Introduction:

FRED DEWS
Managing Editor, Podcasts and Digital Projects
The Brookings Institution

Host:

LINDSEY FORD
David M. Rubenstein Fellow, Foreign Policy,
Center for East Asia Policy Studies
The Brookings Institution

Guests:

JEFFREY BALL
Scholar-in-residence, Steyer-Taylor Center for Energy Policy and Finance
Stanford University
Nonresident Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Energy Security and Climate Initiative
The Brookings Institution

SAMANTHA GROSS
Director, Energy Security and Climate Initiative
Fellow, Foreign Policy, Energy Security and Climate Initiative
The Brookings Institution

ANNELIES GOGER
David M. Rubenstein Fellow
Metropolitan Policy Program
The Brookings Institution

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

DEWS: Welcome to the Brookings Cafeteria, the podcast about ideas and the experts who have them. I'm Fred Dews. Today's episode is another edition of our special Global China series. Guest hosts Lindsey Ford, a David M. Rubenstein Fellow in Foreign Policy, interviews two scholars whose papers for the series address the global energy trade and China's foreign investments and how these issues affect climate change. I'll let Lindsey introduce them to you in a moment.

Also on today's show a new Metro Lens from Annelies Goger, a David M. Rubenstein Fellow in the Metropolitan Policy Program, who explains why, especially in the wreckage of the COVID-19 pandemic, we need to abandon the idea of a skills gap in the labor market, and instead focus on closing what she calls the opportunity gap.

You can follow the Brookings Podcast Network on twitter @PolicyPodcasts to get information about and links to all our shows, including Dollar & Sense: The Brookings Trade Podcast, the Current, and our events podcast. First up, here's Annelies Goger.

GOGER: This is Annelies Goger. I'm a David M. Rubenstein Fellow in the Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program. I'm an economic geographer, and my work focuses on addressing economic inequality and inclusive economic development.

The COVID-19 pandemic has wreaked havoc on our economy over the past six months, and the tight labor markets of early 2020 now seem like a distant memory. Just last month, in August 19 million Americans remained unemployed or otherwise out of work. We're starting to see more attention being paid to the question of what are we going to do to reconnect people to jobs, especially those workers who are not likely to see their old job come back anytime soon.

Although there were 11.5 million fewer jobs in August than there were in February, the

prevailing narrative about our labor market problems continues to focus on a skills gap. It is peculiar that many business leaders continue to center the problem on unqualified individuals, even in the current labor market.

Last week, Luther Jackson from NOVAworks in Silicon Valley, and I published a blog in which we argued it's time to change the narrative. The labor market doesn't have a skills gap, it has an opportunity gap.

I want to emphasize three points from our piece. First, framing labor market problems as a skills gap is deficit oriented thinking, focusing on a lack of skills in the individual. It treats labor markets as transactional, assuming that we exist in a neutral level playing field that affords all people equal opportunity.

In short, it blames the individual for the failures of a workforce system in a society. In real life skills are just one of a complex set of factors that lead to labor market success. Other factors include access to elite education and professional networks. For example, the Caper Center found that although 20 percent of computer science graduates are Back or Latinx, they represent only 10 percent of the people employed in the tech sector, and only 2 percent of venture backed startup founders. We don't lack talent, we're systematically failing to identify and cultivate it.

Second, closing the opportunity gap is not about charity. It's a step to unleashing regional innovation and community wellbeing. Creating workplace cultures that incentivize learning and ongoing talent development will not only benefit individuals who have been shut out of the labor market, it will help employers keep their whole workforce agile and able to keep up with new technologies, benefiting society as a whole. Scholars estimate that investing more in our last Einsteins would quadruple innovation in the United States.

Finally, the pandemic threatens to deepen racial inequality in the United States because it's disproportionately impacted low wage workers, such as those in hospitality, or other service sector jobs. Women, Black and Latinx workers and young workers were overrepresented in these jobs before the pandemic.

In the wake of the killings of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor, Black Lives Matter protests also highlight the urgent need to address deep histories of segregation that continue to pose an existential threat to the everyday lives of Black Americans and their ability to contribute to our collective economic success.

The work of dismantling structural racism must extend to our labor markets as well. We need to take a deep look at how social factors such as race, age, gender, all combined to exclude Black and Latinx workers from access to quality jobs and secure livelihoods. Closing the opportunity gap means making changes to talent recruitment pipelines, hiring processes and management practices. It means investing more holistically to ensure more equal access to information about careers and how to navigate them, how to build professional networks, affordable education and on the job training, a first job or work experience in a new field, and other elements that are critical for success such as having childcare transportation. And it's important to really think about that right now in this pandemic.

As we begin to approach recovery from the pandemic and it's uneven economic impacts, we need to reflect on what each of us can do to dismantle structural racism and counteract the pandemic's uneven effects. It starts by shifting the narrative from a framing on skill deficits to one that sees diverse talent as the nation's most important asset. It can end with an economy that has multiple pathways to opportunity for all workers, not simply a return to the pre-pandemic normal. Thank you for listening, you can read our full piece at Brookings.edu.

DEWS: And now here's Lindsey Ford, and guests, with another Global China interview.

FORD: In today's episode, we're going to talk about China's energy and climate policies, which is a really important topic and also one that I, as a security expert, know far too little about. So, I am very lucky to have two extremely knowledgeable colleagues here to help make us all smart today, Samantha Gross and Jeffrey Ball. Samantha, Jeff, thanks so much for joining us today.

GROSS: Thanks for having us.

BALL: Good to be with you.

FORD: Samantha is the Director of the Energy Security and Climate Initiative here at Brookings and a Fellow in our Foreign Policy Program. Jeff is a Nonresident Senior Fellow at Brookings. In his day job, he's also a Scholar in Residence at Stanford's Steyer Taylor Center for Energy Policy and Finance, where he directs a project looking at the environmental implications of China's clean energy investment.

Now Jeff, and Samantha, you two have written really nice complimentary papers I think for the Global China series that we are publishing this month that look at China's energy policies. And more specifically, they talk about the transition that they have been trying to make to green tech and some of the impact this has had both domestically and internationally.

The papers I thought were really rich with a lot of data on what China is doing domestically, but also talking about the infrastructure and the technology that it's selling overseas. And I hope that it's obvious to people why, what China is doing on its energy and climate policies matter globally.

But Jeff, you had a couple of statistics that I thought really helped drive the point home. And you talked about, in terms of BRI countries and countries who participate in the BRI, that

were they to continue essentially doing business as usual, by 2030, those countries would make up two thirds, I believe, of global emission.

And I thought that was a great point that just really crystallized in this simple way, why what China does internationally matters just as much as what it does domestically.

And one of the things that I thought was really interesting and challenging from a policymaking perspective as well, that you both emphasize in these papers, is that when it comes to climate and energy policy, China is essentially a paradox. It is both the biggest consumer of coal, one of the largest sources of global spread of coal technology in the world, while at the same time being a world leader in developing, producing renewable technologies.

So, I wanted to kind of dig into that paradox a bit and start by talking about China's domestic energy policies for a minute before we get into the global discussion. So, Samantha, you dig into this in your paper, and you talk about how China has been attempting to diversify its energy mix over the last decade or so. And that it's making progress, but it's still a pretty incomplete process. Walk us through, if you will, what you see as some of the more important evolutions in China's energy policy over the past decade.

Thanks, Lindsey. I think one of the most important things to remember about China's energy system is that they're very dependent on imports. It's not that they don't have domestic energy sources, they do, they have very significant coal resources, I mean also some oil and gas. But because of their voracious consumption of energy and the incredible growth that we've seen over the past couple of decades in China's economy, they're still a very, very large energy importer.

And so that colors how China approaches energy issues. They think a lot about their energy systems through an energy security lens. And that brings out some of this paradox that

Lindsey, you brought up. And that's part of the reason why they are very coal reliant, because they have significant coal resources. But also why you see them pushing so hard on renewables on wind and solar, because that could reduce their reliance on imported fuels. Particularly their emphasis on electric vehicles, because that can reduce their dependence on imported oil.

So, you see China really pushing for some of these new technologies, not just from an environmental perspective, but also from an energy security perspective, and a perspective of wanting to develop these industries, because they see these as industries of the future and areas where China can really develop its industrial base. And so that paradox is there. But it arrives from a somewhat logical thought process on the part of the Chinese government.

FORD: And how much progress would you say the Chinese are actually making? I mean, they're certainly developing, producing a lot of green technology and solar and wind, how much is this actually contributing to reducing their reliance on sources of energy like coal?

GROSS: Well, I mean, the Chinese renewable industry is growing faster than anywhere else in the world. Over the last decade, China added 36 percent of the world's total wind and solar capacity. And in 2017, at their peak, they were 45 percent of the global add. And so they're a really significant portion of the global renewables market.

However, despite those incredible growth rates and large additions, they're still a relatively small part of China's electricity mix, about 10 percent right now. Which is a lot for these new technologies, but still has a long way to go to really displace coal and become a larger part of their electricity mix.

FORD: So, how does China's use of renewables as it's been trying to diversify its energy mix, how does that compare to say the proportion of renewables that you see countries like the United States, or perhaps in European countries using?

GROSS: So, China's level, at 10 percent, is actually pretty similar to the level here in the United States. But it's a little more than half the level that you see in Europe. However, you have to remember that China's electricity system is huge and growing, and so that 10 percent of Chinese generation amounts to a lot of wind and solar power.

FORD: And that's a great point, even at relatively small proportions, 10 percent simply the scale of China's energy needs make the overall quantity of wind and solar so significant globally.

GROSS: Exactly.

FORD: So, Samantha, in November 2014, former President Barack Obama and Chinese President Xi Jinping made what was considered a pretty historic announcement at the time, where they issued a Joint Announcement on climate change. And the point was to emphasize the commitments of both countries were making to supporting the Paris Climate Agreement.

And we know that obviously, under the current U.S. administration, they have a bit of a different perspective on climate and energy policies. I'm curious in China, how they are doing in following through or not on the Paris commitments that they've made.

GROSS: Sure. The agreement that the United States and the Chinese government came to in 2014 in advance of the Paris Agreement really helped to get the Paris Agreement done. It showed two very different countries were both committed to the process, and it was really important to getting the whole agreement together.

The U.S. has abandoned its commitments under the Paris Agreement under the Trump administration. But China looks like it's on track to meet its Nationally Determined Contribution, or NDC. However, there were certainly some grumblings that the Chinese NDC wasn't particularly strict. Rather than being a strict limit on greenhouse gas emissions, they promised to

peak by a certain date, that was 2030. And it looks like that will happen. And they also made some promises about renewable energy. And it looks like they're on track to meet those.

FORD: Jeff, I want to turn to you for a second and talk a little bit more picking up on the international commitments that China's made, to talk about some of the global impacts of China's energy policies. And you talk a lot in your paper about one of the biggest issues that's out there, which is China's Belt and Road Initiative. Which for those who may not follow this, is an enormous and also sort of amorphous economic development or infrastructure initiative that is working to build connectivity between China and a lot of countries across Eurasia.

And a big part of this geostrategic logic of this initiative, as well as a lot of the specific development projects involved with it, are energy focus. And the BRI has gotten attention for a lot of reasons. But on the energy front, one of the concerns has been that China is essentially spreading a lot of the high polluting energy technologies like coal that maybe it would like to transition away from at home overseas.

And you talk about, in your paper, Jeff, it's a big deal for a lot of reasons. Not least of which is the one I mentioned before, which is just the degree to which these countries who are involved in the BRI will contribute to global emissions over the next decade. But you also say that the important question is not so much is China spreading dirty tech? Yes, they are. But more, are they building dirtier infrastructure than other countries? So, how do you assess that question?

BALL: It's good to be with you. I think it bears repeating the extent to which China is a paradox here. I mean, is China dirty or clean in terms of its energy infrastructure? The answer is, yes. And everything that China does, China does big.

So, as a predicate, the reason we're having this conversation is that the extent to which what China does in its energy system is low carbon, or high carbon, has huge implications for

global climate change, has more implications for global climate change, then I think it's fair to say anything any other country does.

Over the past 20 years or so, China's effect on the global environment has been largely about what China has done within China's borders. Over the next 20 years and beyond, China's greatest effect on the international environment will be about what Chinese money does beyond China's borders. That has to do with a slowing rate of economic growth in China. It has to do with a transition in the nature of the Chinese economy. And it has to do with the quickness with which other developing economies around the world are growing.

So, the question about how clean or dirty is what Chinese money is financing abroad is huge, hugely important. It's unclear. And it's actually very different in the answer from one country in which China is investing to another. In some countries what Chinese money is bankrolling in terms of energy infrastructure is largely renewable. In some countries it's largely coal.

FORD: And one of the things that I appreciate that you highlighted in the paper was that we have to think about this question of, is China supplying dirty or clean tech? Not just as a supply question, but we've got to think of the demand side of the equation. And that there is a pulse out there as well in terms of the types of technologies that China is promoting through the BRI. It's not just foisting coal technology on unwilling partners. So, how much do you see, let's say the receiving country, their preferences shaping the types of energy projects that are going up through the BRI?

BALL: Yeah, I think this is a really important point. There is a view, I think it's fair to say in much of the West, and particularly in the United States, and particularly in Washington, that what China does around the world is almost exclusively a function of decisions that are

made in Beijing.

And in terms of China's investments abroad, as I think is the case in terms of much of China's foreign activities, the situation is more complicated than that. We're engaged in a good bit of research at Stanford where I work, about the nature of the carbon intensity of China's energy infrastructure investments around the world. And although the research is in its early stages, what becomes quite clear is that what China builds in terms of energy infrastructure in emerging economies around the world, depends to a large degree on what those emerging countries say that they want.

And so in certain countries, what China is building is quite clean, and others it's much dirtier. That's a really, I think, important reality because it suggests that to the extent that people want to change what China is investing in for the purposes of climate or anything else, that the place one ought to go to have some impact is not just China. The place one ought to go is other places that have agency in what China is building.

And that goes to a broader point, I think, which goes to China's motives. Is what China is doing in terms of its investment in infrastructure around the world largely about geopolitics, or is it largely about making money?

FORD: And so, my next question I guess is to both of you, there's been a lot of discussion about this idea of "greening the BRI". And I'm just curious, Jeff, maybe coming to you first, is that a viable idea? And if so, would you put more of your emphasis on the conversation that we need to have with Beijing, or on the countries who are buying and adopting Chinese energy projects?

BALL: Let me make three quick points. The first is that, Lindsey, as you alluded to earlier, the BRI is a somewhat problematic moniker, Belt and Road Initiative. And it's

problematic because it's quite unclear what counts as part of the Belt and Road Initiative and what doesn't. What's more important is less the semantics of what BRI includes, than the nature of Chinese investment in infrastructure around the world. So, that's kind of a semantic point.

I think it's important to look at what's happening in China as influence in what China is spending on abroad. And it's important to look abroad. What China is investing in abroad is to a real extent, and Samantha reflected at this earlier, a function of the changing economy in Chin. There is a battle in China, just like there is a battle in the United States and in many countries around the world, between the blocks in favor of fossil fuel energy and the blocks in favor of renewable energy to kind of be very reductionist about it.

And it's far from clear who wins that fight and who wins what bits of that fight. But it is a Battle Royale in China, perhaps more than anywhere else, because the stakes are so huge, because the economy is so huge. And because, as Samantha said earlier, the forces of coal and the forces of renewables in China are huge and globally relevant. So, that battle that is going on in China has huge implications for what China invests in, or doesn't invest in abroad.

And just quickly, the third point is that what countries want has significant implications as well. And so if one wants to make a difference it's really important to interact with governments around the world that have made, to use some of Samantha's terminology, their own nationally determined contributions in the wake of Paris, their own promises to the world about what they claim they will do for the climate and have to meet those promises.

FORD: Samantha, let me come to you with the same question, tagging on to what Jeff just said.

GROSS: Sure, I generally agree with everything that Jeff said. One thing that I might add is this Battle Royale that's taking place on the renewable side versus the older coal technology

side.

A lot of this is industrial policy to try to keep these manufacturers going. As the Chinese economy has slowed a bit, you're seeing power demand still growing in China, but less. And so they have these engineering and construction contractors who are looking for things to do. And in part, they're working on some of these Belt and Road Initiative projects abroad.

And so yes, countries are going to get what they want, the Chinese are willing to sell them what they want to buy. But I think on both sides of that equation, you can at least push for them to buy the best technology.

Something we're seeing right now is about a quarter of the BRI associated projects in coal, and I know that's a fuzzy term, I agree with Jeff on that. But they're for subcritical technology, which is the least efficient coal fired generation technology.

And so would it at least be nice to see the Chinese sellers and third country buyers at least find the most efficient technology when they can. If they choose to use coal for their own reasons, often energy security reasons, at the very least use the most efficient technologies you can.

FORD: Yeah, that's a great point, that it doesn't necessarily have to be immediately leaping from say coal to massive amounts of solar and wind, but you could at least improve on the coal technology that you're using.

It sounds like what both of you are saying is in some ways there's going to be some complicated tradeoffs here in the sense that, if and as China continues to be under pressure to improve or reduce emissions at home, that there are going to continue to be pretty strong incentives then for them to take some of that technology that they're not using at home and export it abroad to address the concerns of domestic constituencies. And so some of those

tradeoffs are not likely to go away in the near future.

BALL: I think that's absolutely right. And I think that that cuts both ways. I mean there are economic incentives the powerful constituencies in China that make their money by selling solar panels and wind turbines and the associated goods around them have to export those goods, which many in the world would call clean energy goods. So, that's a powerful voice in China increasingly powerful, although to use a wonky term, often a much smaller base.

Nevertheless, in particular parts of China, particular provinces of China, That's a very important, politically important constituency. And of course, there is still a very politically powerful coal lobby in China that wants, as every lobby, does to export its stuff, as economic growth slows.

I just point out one thing, which is that there's a disconnect between the rigor of China's domestic regulations on the cleanliness of coal and China's regulations on the cleanliness of coal that it sells abroad, coal fired technology that it sells abroad.

And there's a lot of discussion in China. Beijing needs no arm twisting on this from the outside. That is to say, Beijing needs no education from people outside China about the severity of this debate. But there's a big debate going on in China about whether and when China automate its environmental restrictions on coal fired technology that it sells beyond its borders, as rigid as those for the technology it deploys domestically.

FORD: So, we've been talking basically about the issue of domestic politics, which I really appreciate you raising. Because I think here in the United States most everyone in the U.S. is obviously familiar with energy security being a hot topic politically, that certainly creates some pretty stark partisan divide in the United States. Perhaps people are less familiar with the fact that energy security creates some pretty strong domestic constituencies and lobbies within

China as well.

So, one thing I wanted to chat a bit about is how an issue that creates a lot of entrenched interests and domestic constituencies in both the United States and China plays out in the context of the bilateral relationship.

And it's an election year here in the United States, so politics is obviously on everyone's mind. Samantha, I am curious to hear from you, there would obviously be some pretty big differences between let's say a second Trump Administration and a potential Biden Administration on climate and energy policy. What do you see as some of the potential implications of those differences on the U.S.-China relationship in the climate and energy space?

GROSS: Sure, I can talk about some things that would only happen in a Biden Administration. And then I can bring up a couple things that I think will happen in either Administration, or at least should.

I think the most important difference between a second Trump administration and a Biden Administration will be that the U.S. will work to reengage on climate. We started back in 2014, we got the Paris process going by setting up this early agreement and sort of show of unity with China. And I think we would like to start again by reestablishing that relationship with China, with the understanding that we are the world's two largest emitters and what we do really matters.

But we'll have to reestablish credibility to engage with China and with the rest of the world. I think that's going to be a real challenge for the Biden administration to show that we're getting our ducks in a row at home and dealing with our own emissions in order to reach out to the world in a way that makes sense, and in a way that the world finds credible. And so that will be an issue with China and with the rest of the world as well.

However, there's some things that I think will happen in either Administration. An important thing I'd like to point out is a relationship between the United States and China in terms of liquefied natural gas, LNG. The U.S. is becoming a very large exporter of LNG because of the gas boom that we've seen here in the United States. And China would like to have more gas in its system because it is a cleaner fuel than coal, both from a local air pollution and a greenhouse gas perspective.

And so they would very much like to have more gas in their system. But they're already well above the gas that they're producing domestically. They're bringing in pipeline gas from Central Asia and from Russia and also Liquefied Natural Gas from various places.

The U.S. and China are logical partners in terms of liquefied natural gas. U.S. contracts tend to be more flexible than those that other producers are able to offer. And so China could be a very good market for us. And they, I think, could very much like the terms that we're offering. But we need to get past getting oil and gas and other goods tied up in all these trade disputes that the Trump Administration has put forward.

And so even during the second Trump administration, it could possibly be good for everybody to deepen our relationship in terms of LNG. And in a Biden Administration as well. They come at that issue from different angles, Trump from his idea of energy dominance, and Biden perhaps thinking of gas as being a cleaner fuel. But I could see that being a good policy under either administration that would be good for everybody.

FORD: Jeff, Samantha mentioned this issue of the various ways that climate and energy policies have gotten wrapped up in some of these trade disputes between the United States and China. I'm curious, have you seen that, in your research, shape some of the domestic debates occurring between these different energy constituencies in China?

BALL: Absolutely. And I think that the international climate debate is often misconstrued as about climate change. When usually it's not. Usually it's said to be about climate change because that sounds good to international ears. And in fact, it's about much more brass tacks domestic issues on all sides. I'll start with China. And then we'll come back to the United States.

I mean, really briefly in China, China's efforts to clean things up that are largely said to be about climate change, are really much more fundamentally about cleaning up local air pollution, the stuff that makes you cough, the stuff that makes skies over Beijing and other cities in China gray and yellow. And it's about technological advancement in the Chinese economy, and it's about jobs. It's about very red and butter issues.

And similarly, what gets said in the United States as being about climate change and the relationship with China over climate, is really much more fundamentally about what's perceived to be domestic economic priorities. Things like jobs, and more to the point, because I think of the realities of at least the way U.S. politicians perceive U.S. politics, about manufacturing jobs.

And so, folded into a long running trade fight between the United States and China has been a series of trade fights over issues pertaining to energy, perhaps the most notable among them solar panels.

And I think it's worth noting that the calculus domestically politically in the United States about who would support saber rattling with China, and who would oppose it, saber rattling, for instance, over tariffs on solar panels that are produced in China and solar equipment produced in China, a lot of that domestic U.S. political calculus has just been wrong.

So, when politicians in both countries stand on their perception of domestic political issues to try to articulate what they believe to be an internationally winning climate strategy

often fails. Which is a long way of saying that, if to the extent that anyone in either of these countries or other countries wants to do something serious about climate change, it's worth thinking about what really will move the needle on climate change. And in that context, what's politically possible given the realities on the ground and countries from the U.S. to China to others.

FORD: That's a great point. Even something that we would like to think of as an issue of shared global interest, at the end of the day it always boils down to what is possible politically at home.

So, let me come to you guys with a final question. The U.S.-China relationship has soured pretty dramatically, which might be an understatement, in the past few years. And I think it's probably unlikely that we would see a total reversal of that, even under a new administration. Climate and energy are often put out there as the few areas where perhaps the U.S. and China might still have some common interest in cooperating.

I am curious to hear from both of you, and you both touched on this in some ways during the podcast, do you still see that cooperation as possible? And if so, where would you suggest that policymakers ought to start? Samantha, maybe I can start with you?

GROSS: Sure. I think that cooperation is still possible, because we so clearly have common interests. China understands climate change, they understand the inherent risks. And Jeff is entirely right, that a lot of things they're doing are happening for reasons other than climate.

But on the other hand, I mean the great majority of their economic growth in their population is coastal. They understand the challenges that climate change could bring with coastal flooding and droughts and everything else. They're as concerned as we are about it, and

there are really logical places for us to cooperate.

I talked about natural gas earlier. Jeff brought up solar panels. We've seen the prices of solar panels in the market just plummet, and that's why solar electricity is growing so fast. A lot of that is because of Chinese manufacturing, and economies of scale and manufacturing that have happened in China. But that's good for everyone. Slapping tariffs on Chinese solar panels isn't necessarily the right thing to do. And those very Chinese panels could help us greatly reduce our emissions here.

We need to think about, rather than being competitive, about cooperating in areas where that cooperation is logical. This Administration hasn't wanted to do that. And I know that being soft on China has a certain political challenge to it. But there are definitely areas where we have common interests. And I would hope at least that we can go back and find those.

FORD: And Jeff, what about you?

BALL: Well, I am speaking to you today from Silicon Valley in California, where I live and work. And I will tell you, I wasn't born and raised in Silicon Valley. And one of the most striking things to me about having spent a number of years here is the extent to which it illustrates a difference between politicians and investors on both sides of the Pacific, that is the U.S. side and the Chinese side, in terms of their view of the relationship between these two countries.

And not to put too fine a point on it, but where there are fists being exchanged between the politicians, there's a kind of desire for real interaction for a handshake between the investors. Because the investors realize that, even though administration's or government officials in Beijing come and go, the motivation to make money by interacting with one another only increases.

And I think that has huge implications for climate change. We are talking here at a time when, for all sorts of reasons about what is going on in the world, and it's fair to say that on a bipartisan basis in many countries there is a dawning consciousness of the imperative to do something about climate change, that didn't exist two years ago. All sorts of polls find that although there is huge disagreement still within countries and among countries about what to do about it.

And I guess that leads to the last thing I'd suggest, which is to be in massive agreement with what Samantha said about cooperating where cooperation is logical. I think it's a really important observation. The notion that the United States and China are going to have a big hug and sing Kumbaya and sublimate their national interests for a perceived desire to cool the planet is, I think naïve. There's very little in the history of the relationship to suggest that that's likely to happen.

Yet, there is all sorts of room for each of these countries to be thoughtful and strategic, and wise about ways that it can fashion its domestic policy and its rational policy, its industrial policy around ways to secure maximum economic benefit through this massive global shift toward decarbonization.

And in the United States, I think it's fair to say a lot of the calculus about how the U.S. plays to its domestic interests has not been very wise. And there's a lot of room to get wiser.

FORD: Well, great suggestions from both of you. And I think we would all welcome a little more wisdom and policymaking these days. So, with that, I just want to thank you both for what's been a really fascinating conversation. I hope everyone will go check out the papers that you two have written for the Global China series.

And I also want to say thank you to everyone who has been tuning in and joining our

Global China podcast series. Our last episode will be coming out next month. So, stay tuned for that. And with that, I'm Lindsey Ford, and this has been another episode of the Brooklyn cafeteria.

DEWS: The Brookings Cafeteria podcast is made possible with the help of an amazing team of colleagues. My thanks go out to Audio Engineer, Gaston Reboredo, Bill Finan, director of the Brookings Institution Press who does the book interviews. Marie Wilkin, Adrianna Pita, and Chris McKenna for their collaboration, and Camilo Ramirez and Emily Horne for their guidance and support.

The Brookings Cafeteria is brought to you by the Brookings Podcast Network, which also produces Dollar and Sense, The Current and our events podcasts. Email your questions or comments to me at bcp@brookings.edu. If you have a question for a scholar, include an audio file and I'll play it and the answer on the air.

Follow us on Twitter at Policy Podcasts. You can listen to the Brookings Cafeteria in all the usual places. Visit us online at brookings.edu. Until next time, I'm Fred Dews.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2024